BOUND VOLUME of HUMAN EVENTS for 1960 may be ordered at pre-publication price of $9.50. Regular price $18. Volumes for 1956, 1958 and 1959 at $18. No other years available.

Human Events — YOUR WASHINGTON SERVICE

Vol. XVIII, No. 4 January 27, 1961 Section I — News

MONEY: *Danger of Democratic wild spending* (49)

BUDGET: *Where the fat shows* .....(49)

ROCKY: *His liberal love feast blossoms* .....(50)

FINLETTER: *Poor NATO choice* .....(51)

HOUSE RULES: *'Packing' danger analyzed* ....(52)

The Dollar Crisis: After President John F. Kennedy took the oath, the new Congress showed ominous signs of going down in history as the "greenback" Congress. For, plainly speaking, that's what many members were calling the legislature's real problem when they were squabbling over the budget.

They know, just as well as they recognize the bells of a quorum call, that an unbalanced budget means deficit financing and that term signifies a flood of printing-press money—in short, "greenbacks." Some individuals (including the 79-year-old Democratic Speaker) can recall that the $1 "greenback" of the 19th century had a value of 35 cents on the morrow of issue.

So, despite Republican and Democratic partisan gabbling over the Ike budget, even Republicans admitted in their cloakrooms that the outgoing President's budget was unjustifiably swollen and deserved as stern a criticism as do the plans of Kennedy's eggheads for "greenback" spending.

Many a GOP member noted with dismay that Ike's budget actually increased foreign aid—in contradiction to his warning about the outflow of gold from the US. For even his own Secretary of the Treasury admitted that slashing foreign aid is the key to solving the problem of the export of our gold reserves.

Noted also was the climb in Ike's budget of funds for Health, Education and Welfare, one of the most flagrant sieves in any budget in the last decade. (See "How to Save $6.9 Billion" story in opposite column.)

Many members reacted with concern last week after Ike asked for expenditures of $81 billion. They recalled that four years ago, in January, 1957, Ike asked what was considered the whopping spending sum of $71 billion—and the grass roots throughout the land arose in spontaneous revolt against this huge sum. Now he has asked for about $10 billion more. That—it was remarked—simply encourages the Kennedy eggheads to ask for many more billions.

"How will we stop the oncoming 'greenbacks' and Kennedy requests for even higher spending?"—this question has one answer among conservatives on Capitol Hill. It is: stop Speaker Rayburn's (and the White House's) attempt to pack the last bulwark against inflation, the Rules Committee of the House. The Rules Committee, under Chairman Howard Smith, has traditionally held back the waves of boondoggling, pork-barrelling and wild spending in general. Now the new Administration wants to pack it with liberals. That means—all admit—more "greenbacks." (See detailed story about the importance of the Rules fight on page 52.)

Conservatives in both parties were heartened on January 19 when the 27-member Republican Policy Committee met and took a unanimous stand against the liberal Democratic assault on the Rules Committee. Republican Whip Leslie Arends then predicted that the "great preponderance" of the GOP House members would likewise firmly oppose Rayburn's "packing" plan when it comes to a floor vote. GOP Representatives Laird, Johansen, Berry, Gross and Byrnes have been strong, front-line defenders of the present structure of the Rules Committee.

In the Republican cloakrooms, many were saying, "If the grass roots wake up and wire protests against packing the Rules Committee to their Congressmen, maybe the majority will see that the country wants to keep the Committee as it has been." [Economy groups in the Capital urge those who want to block wild spending to telegraph their Congressmen, also House GOP leader Charles Halleck, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., as well as Speaker Sam Rayburn, same address, protesting the Rules packing plan.]

How to Save $6.9 Billion: Directly following the release of President Eisenhower's last (fiscal 1962) budget, HUMAN EVENTS gave it a thorough analysis and, as in previous years, found much fat in non-essential, non-defense spending. The team of analysts who went over the budget pinpointed their efforts to where cuts could be made without impairing essential spending or national security.

The list includes 25 non-defense budget items in which the government has substantially increased expenditures over the low figures of earlier Ike budgets. The table below gives the increase sought

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for each item in the current budget requests over previous Eisenhower "low expenditure" years (from 1953 to 1957).

Activity	*Increase (In millions of dollars)*
Conduct of foreign affairs	$159
Foreign information and exchange activities	88
Aviation (non-defense)	632
Water transportation	272
Housing and community development	376
Promotion and regulation of business	601
Agricultural land and water resources	483
Rural electrification and telephone loans	136
Research and other agricultural services	184
Land and water resources	581
Forests	192
National Parks	66
Fish and wildlife	41
Minerals	30
General resource surveys and other	26
Public assistance	887
Public health	819
Education	315
School lunch and special milk programs	145
Science, research, libraries and museums	198
Vocational rehabilitation and other	77
Property and records management	303
Central personnel costs	152
Legislative and judicial functions	95
District of Columbia, territories and possessions	76
TOTAL	$6,934

These 25 items in the 1962 budget add up to an increase of $6,934 million over the low point in the years 1953 to 1957. In each case the increase is far above that which might have been caused by monetary inflation. Noted is that none of the items pertains to national security or defense. Also noted is that these items contain no reference to the approximately $2.5 billion earmarked for foreign economic assistance. Such controversial spending categories as postal service, price supports and related programs, veterans services and benefits and farm ownership and operation loans have not been included.

Senator Harry Flood Byrd said in regard to the budget: "There is urgent need for reduction in Federal expenditures and a balanced budget with surplus if we are to preserve confidence in the dollar."

The Virginian noted that he predicted a deficit for last year's budget, although Ike predicted that there would be a $4.2 billion surplus. Byrd was right. A budget surplus of $1.5 billion is predicted for the coming fiscal year, but Byrd predicted that "there will be another deficit next year unless Federal expenditures are substantially reduced."

Recession Scaremongers: Barely after Ike had submitted his precariously balanced $80.9 billion budget to Congress, the zealots of the incoming Kennedy forces promised to up the ante and write off the next fiscal year in red ink. Nervously pointing to the 4.5 million unemployment figure (some claimed that times were the worst since '40), eager-beaver Kennedyites planned to bust the swollen budget with public housing programs, Federal aid to schools and other "anti-slump" measures, needed, they said, to get the people back to work.

Financial conservatives, however, look askance at such inflationary proposals. Furthermore, while the inflationists have seized upon the unemployment figure to open the floodgates of the Treasury, conservatives point out that the Labor Department has so juggled this statistic in recent years as to make it almost meaningless to compare unemployment totals this year with those of some years ago.

According to official government publications, for example, nearly 1,000,000 persons are now counted as unemployed who would not have been counted as unemployed under the old tabulation system used by the Labor Department under the New and Fair Deals.

In 1954, for example, the Department devised a different method of computing the unemployed so that an additional 700,000 persons—who would not have appeared in previous unemployment figures under the Roosevelt-Truman Administrations—appeared in the unemployment total put out by Ike. Moreover, in 1958 the Labor Department changed the definition of an unemployed person so that an additional 200,000 were added to the unemployment figure.

Under the pre-1954 counting method, then, the December, 1960 unemployment figure under Eisenhower would be smaller than 3.6 million, which is less than the 3.7 million unemployed under Truman during December, 1949, his last peacetime year.

Rocky: The far-left New York State Liberal party appeared last week to have broken away from its longtime tie to the Democratic mast in answer to Nelson Rockefeller's political siren call. HUMAN EVENTS reported December 29 that Rocky was going all out in his attempts to woo the Liberal party in order to insure a big re-election plurality in 1962 as a springboard to the 1964 GOP Presidential nomination.

Evidence of his success came with a statement issued by Paul R. Hays, state chairman of the Liberal party. The Liberal chief lauded Rockefeller's very liberal legislative program and had high praise for the Governor himself. The New York *Times* quoted the Liberal statement as saying: "Governor Rockefeller, unlike the majority of Republicans, supported the view that government should play a positive role in the economic and social life of the community and recognized the need for government planning in many areas."

The Liberals stated that they disagreed with Nelson on only a few subjects and then in just a matter of degrees.

Even political tenderfeet in the Empire State realize that this major Liberal party statement virtually assures Nelson of the party's 1962 backing and of the 400,000 or so votes it commands. But

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many observers see the Governor as outsmarting himself. For not only has he become one of the most unpopular figures in the Republican party because of his ultra liberalism and opportunistic capers; he appears likely to alienate two conservative voters for every liberal he attracts.

This fact may not catch up with him in 1962 in the New York gubernatorial race because of lack of opposition from a split Democratic party. But GOP pros are aware that the total nation-wide conservative vote for President last year was greater than the liberal; they calculate that over the country in 1964 most liberals may prefer Kennedy to Rockefeller, while great numbers of conservatives would stay home rather than support the New Yorker.

New Jersey: Although recent Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell has the complete backing of Senator Clifford Case for the New Jersey GOP gubernatorial nomination (HUMAN EVENTS, January 20), the opposition to him in the Garden State is mounting.

The press now reports that nine of eleven Republicans in the state senate are opposed to Mitchell. What the press doesn't mention is that the other two have been absent, but are thought to be opposed to Mitchell, making it unanimous. The nine who announced against Mitchell said in their statement: "We believe no one should be considered for the high office of Governor who has not been active in and is not familiar with the affairs of the state." The president of the State Council of Carpenters (AFL-CIO) said of the nominal Jerseyite: "The Republican party should turn a deaf ear to the pleas of absentee politicians who are far removed from the New Jersey scene and the actual day to day effort required to solve the problems of our state."

But although opposition to Mitchell is strong and from many quarters, there is growing unhappiness that his opposition is split three ways.

Three state senators, Wayne Dumont, Charles Sandman and Walter Jones, plan to oppose Mitchell in the April 18 primary. Jones is considered very able and is thought to have the most strength of the three. But in any event wise heads are counseling the senators to decide on one man, lest the inept Mitchell be nominated and the ultra-liberal Clifford Case receive a boost in stature which most of his fellow Republicans in the state feel he doesn't deserve.

Capitol Camera: Kennedy and Rusk at odds over appointments. Kennedy preferred McGeorge Bundy as Undersecretary of State, Professor W. W. Rostow to head State Department's policy staff. Rusk objected, but Kennedy appointed Bundy to National Security Council, and may find another job for Rostow anyway. (See last week's HUMAN EVENTS.)

• *Results of State Department's anti-Trujillo diplomacy are in: Trujillo now "soft" on Castro, permits viciously anti-American broadcasts. One Latin American expert says new Administration should woo dictator back—if Trujillo falls, either a Castro or a strongman more dictatorial than Trujillo will emerge.*

• Task force headed by economist Paul Samuelson, who suggests ways for Kennedy to stimulate the economy, called for increased public spending, but left out a recommendation for rapid depreciation allowances so businesses could expand more rapidly. Report said to be influenced strongly by Kennedy's chief economic adviser, Walter Heller.

• *While Republicans have one-vote majority in Illinois House of Representatives, Democrats elected Speaker by persuading three Republicans to take a walk at the time of the vote. The three also get a salary from the Democratic-dominated Chicago sanitation board.*

• Mr. Paul H. Nitze is Kennedy's Assistant Secretary of Defense. The 1958-59 report of the influential Council of Foreign Relations states: "Mr. Nitze spoke on the possibilities of fruitful negotiations between the United States and the Sino-Soviet bloc in the foreseeable future."

• *Khrushchev's 20,000-word speech urged the development of "peace fronts" throughout the world, including pacifists of all political beliefs. Last October 14, Nobel Prize winning chemist Linus Pauling declared at a public rally in Orchestra Hall in Chicago that the pacifist Sane Nuclear Policy Committee should be a "peace movement open to all."*

• John Kenneth Galbraith, Kennedy's economic adviser, is expected to be named Ambassador to India. Galbraith recently criticized the U-2 flights as a "preoccupation with military operations."

NATO's Ambassador: In a typical political appointment, President Kennedy has chosen former Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter to be Ambassador to NATO. The action is a direct slap at Tammany leader Carmine DeSapio, whom Finletter has opposed with part of New York's liberal faction. DeSapio blocked Finletter's nomination to the US Senate in 1958.

While Kennedy may have enhanced himself with the liberals in New York, this political appointment bodes no good for the NATO military organization, in need of a stiff spine. Finletter thinks much along the lines of Adlai Stevenson, the man he supported for President. His views on foreign policy are summarized in his book, *Foreign Policy, The Next Phase.*

"In Europe," he remarks at one point, "the threat is Russian military power," yet he says NATO's "military functions become less necessary" and that NATO should stress "economic functions." He feels

BEN F. JENSEN, Republican Congressman from Iowa: "My frequent regret is that there are so few organs in the United States today, which devote, as does HUMAN EVENTS, their entire energies to the cause of fundamental Americanism."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it should carry out foreign aid programs, similar to the United Nations Special Fund. In short, he wants to metamorphize what is supposed to be a hard-core military organization into a giant giveaway project.

Nor is he expected to get much opposition from the other NATO countries in trying to sell them the idea of giving away American dollars. Finletter also believes that the US has been unreasonable in asking Russia to open up its "closed society," as he euphemistically chooses to call it, in any disarmament agreement. Finletter says: "We must not expect the Russians to give up their closed society and the military secrecy it gives them without a *quid pro quo.*" Finletter does not enlighten us on what *quid* must be given up for their *quo.*

While the pro-Western forces in Laos try to regain that country militarily, Finletter's comments on Asian policy seem strangely anachronistic, although the book was written in 1960. On page 213 Finletter says that the US policy has made "progress" in Asia since we are "moving away" from "our previous concentration on military measures in Asia—on military treaties, collective arrangements such as SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) and the Baghdad Pact, and particularly 'massive retaliation' and 'pinpointed retaliation.'" Finletter also wants to recognize Red China. Query: Is *this* the next phase?

Why Republicans Must Fight Against The Packing of the Rules Committee

By Emily Cuyler Hammond

The House Rules Committee stands in these turbulent days as a bulwark of responsible government. With few exceptions, the great flood of bills which are reported out of their respective committees—the Ways and Means Committee, Banking and Currency Committee, and the Education and Labor Committee, for instance—must channel through the Rules Committee.

Literally thousands of bills thrown in the hopper each year die in their own committees, while about nine out of ten sent to the Rules Committee are cleared. The remainder, which are denied access to the floor, are usually of the big-spending, pork barrel variety dear to the hearts and pocketbooks of some high-powered special interest, but bad for the country as a whole. Thus the Rules Committee functions as a "traffic cop" directing the bills that are to come up for consideration.

But it also acts as a scapegoat to take the blame for the demise of pork barrel bills which are the embodiment of campaign promises Congressmen would prefer never to have to vote for. A Congressman who has promised his constituents a piece of the moon, at a cost to the general taxpayer of $100 million, finds it mighty convenient to blame Chairman of Rules Howard W. Smith, of Virginia, for not permitting the proposal to reach the floor.

On the other hand, if this "piece of the moon" bill has real merit, our Congressman has no excuse: there are several ways he can get his bill before the House without the consent of Chairman Smith's committee. For instance, he can file a discharge petition signed by the majority of the members, or he can have his bill brought up on Calendar Wednesday—a device needing a two-thirds majority to win.

The reasons back of the Rules of the House are: (1) The necessity, if democracy is not to degenerate into dictatorship or chaos, for the checks and balances provided for in the Constitution. The Rules Committee is one of the most important of the congressional checks on a too-powerful, wild-spending Executive. (2) The protection of the whole people—the taxpayers in general—from the maneuverings of the self-interest pressure groups. (3) The protection of minorities from the dictates of the majority.

Periodically in the past, attempts have been made to reduce the effectiveness of the Rules Committee. But Speaker Rayburn's present effort to pack and thus liberalize it holds special dangers: First, President Kennedy, as Congressman August E. Johansen has succinctly pointed out, gave notice that he will be prepared "to exercise the fullest powers of his office—all that are specified and some that are not." Second, the Democratic party platform calls for spending of a magnitude which could unbalance not only our own economy but also that of the whole world.

In his "Manual of Parliamentary Practice," Thomas Jefferson said:

> "So far the maxim is certainly true, and is founded in good sense, that as it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted as they were found necessary, from time to time, and are become the law of the House, *by a strict adherence to which the weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check,* and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities." (Italics added.)

The Republicans—most of their leaders emphasize today—as the "weaker party" in the Congress, must vote against the packing of the Rules Committee, in their own interest, in the interest of responsible government and in the interest of the entire American people.

Published weekly at 410 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C. **TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate $12.50; 6 months $6.50;** 3 months $3.50. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

For change of address send old address **EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS** on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number, if any). **ALLOW US TWO WEEKS** to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound volumes indexed, $18. Only 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT GEORGE O. FOWLER
ALLAN H. RYSKIND SVEND PETERSEN
Business Manager: W. B. HICKS, JR. *Contributing Editor*: FRANK CHODOROV

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What You Can Do

A REGULAR FEATURE IN YOUR WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Human Events

Vol. XVIII, No. 4 — Section II

January 27, 1961

Roster of Congressmen

The lists on these pages give

(1) the names of all the 100 Senators and 437 House Members,

(2) the home city of each,

(3) age,

(4) years of present service (some have had broken periods of service)

(5) ACA-Index ratings.

In the case of Representatives, the number of each one's congressional district appears at the left. A few states have one or two Members who are elected on a statewide basis; these at large Representatives do not have numbered districts.

Republicans are listed in CAPITAL letters and Democrats in small letters.

Mail and telegrams should be addressed to Senators at Senate Office Building and Representatives at House Office Building, as the case may be, Washington, D. C.

The ACA-Index is a statistical evaluation of the voting record of the United States Senators (1955-59) and members of the House of Representatives (1957-59). It can be purchased from HUMAN EVENTS for $15 per copy.

Member and Home City	Age	Service Began	ACA
ALABAMA			
L. Hill, Montgomery	66	1938	15
J.J. Sparkman, Huntsville	61	1946	11
ALASKA			
E.L. Bartlett, Juneau	56	1959	21
E. Gruening, Juneau	73	1959	27
ARIZONA			
C.T. Hayden, Phoenix	83	1927	16
B.M. GOLDWATER, Phoenix	52	1953	98
ARKANSAS			
J.L. McClellan, Camden	64	1943	58
J.W. Fulbright, Fayetteville	55	1945	26
CALIFORNIA			
T.H. KUCHEL, Anaheim	50	1953	58
C. Engle, Red Bluff	49	1959	10
COLORADO			
G.L. ALLOTT, Lamar	54	1955	73
J.A. Carroll, Denver	59	1957	2
CONNECTICUT			
P. BUSH, Greenwich	65	1952	67
T.J. Dodd, West Hartford	53	1959	23
DELAWARE			
J.J. WILLIAMS, Millsboro	56	1947	99
J.C. BOGGS, Wilmington	51	1961	-
FLORIDA			
S.L. Holland, Bartow	68	1946	58
G.A. Smathers, Miami	47	1951	38
GEORGIA			
R.B. Russell, Winder	63	1933	61
H.E. Talmadge, Lovejoy	47	1957	53
HAWAII			
H.L. FONG, Honolulu	53	1959	-
O.E. Long, Honolulu	71	1959	-
IDAHO			
H.C. DWORSHAK, Burley	66	1949	86
F. Church, Boise	36	1957	6
ILLINOIS			
P.H. Douglas, Chicago	68	1949	15
E.M. DIRKSEN, Pekin	65	1951	79
INDIANA			
H.E. CAPEHART, Washington	63	1945	74
V. Hartke, Evansville	41	1959	5
IOWA			
B.B. HICKENLOOPER, Cedar Rapids	64	1945	83
J.R. MILLER, Sioux City	44	1961	-
KANSAS			
A.F. SCHOEPPEL, Wichita	66	1949	87
F. CARLSON, Concordia	68	1950	63
KENTUCKY			
J.S. COOPER, Somerset	59	1956	27
T.B. MORTON, Glenview	53	1957	67
LOUISIANA			
A.J. Ellender, Houma	70	1937	44
R.B. Long, Baton Rouge	42	1948	33
MAINE			
MRS. M.C. SMITH, Skowhegan	63	1949	51
E.S. Muskie, Waterville	46	1959	12
MARYLAND			
J.M. BUTLER, Baltimore	63	1951	93
J.G. BEALL, Frostburg	66	1953	60
MASSACHUSETTS			
L. SALTONSTALL, Dover	68	1945	69
B.A. Smith II, Gloucester	43	1961	-
MICHIGAN			
P.V. McNamara, Detroit	66	1955	0
P.A. Hart, Mackinac Island	48	1959	0
MINNESOTA			
H.H. Humphrey, Waverly	49	1949	1
E.J. McCarthy, St. Paul	44	1959	4
MISSISSIPPI			
J.O. Eastland, Doddsville	56	1943	62
J.C. Stennis, De Kalb	59	1947	60
MISSOURI			
W.S. Symington, St. Louis	59	1953	4
E.V. Long, Bowling Green	52	1960	-
MONTANA			
M.J. Mansfield, Missoula	57	1953	8
L. Metcalf, Helena	49	1961	3*
NEBRASKA			
R.L. HRUSKA, Omaha	56	1954	93
C.T. CURTIS, Minden	55	1955	91
NEVADA			
A. Bible, Reno	51	1954	33
H.W. Cannon, Las Vegas	49	1959	20
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
S. BRIDGES, Concord	62	1937	92
N. COTTON, Lebanon	60	1954	88
NEW JERSEY			
C.P. CASE, Rahway	56	1955	43
H.A. Williams, Jr., Westfield	41	1959	11
NEW MEXICO			
D. Chavez, Albuquerque	72	1935	21
C.P. Anderson, Albuquerque	65	1949	32
NEW YORK			
J.K. JAVITS, New York City	56	1957	33
K.B. KEATING, Rochester	60	1959	72
NORTH CAROLINA			
S.J. Ervin, Jr., Morganton	64	1954	43
B.E. Jordan, Saxapahaw	64	1958	51
NORTH DAKOTA			
M.R. YOUNG, La Moure	63	1945	45
Q.N. Burdick, Fargo	52	1960	5*
OHIO			
F.J. Lausche, Cleveland	65	1957	81
S.M. Young, Cleveland	71	1959	13
OKLAHOMA			
R.S. Kerr, Oklahoma City	64	1949	30
A.S.M. Monroney, Oklahoma City	58	1951	18
OREGON			
W.L. Morse, Eugene	60	1945	5
Mrs. M.B. Neuberger, Portland	52	1961	-
PENNSYLVANIA			
J.S. Clark, Philadelphia	59	1957	4
H. SCOTT, Philadelphia	60	1959	57
RHODE ISLAND			
J.O. Pastore, Cranston	53	1950	17
C. Pell, Newport	42	1961	-
SOUTH CAROLINA			
O.D. Johnston, Spartanburg	64	1945	29
S. Thurmond, Aiken	58	1956	78
SOUTH DAKOTA			
K.E. MUNDT, Madison	60	1948	73
F.H. CASE, Custer	64	1951	71
TENNESSEE			
E. Kefauver, Chattanooga	57	1949	6
A. Gore, Carthage	53	1953	11
TEXAS			
R.W. Yarborough, Austin	57	1957	6
W.A. Blakley, Dallas	62	1961	-
UTAH			
W.F. BENNETT, Salt Lake City	62	1951	84
F.E. Moss, Salt Lake City	49	1959	4
VERMONT			
G.D. AIKEN, Putney	68	1941	36
W.L. PROUTY, Newport	54	1959	54
VIRGINIA			
H.F. Byrd, Berryville	73	1933	92
A.W. Robertson, Lexington	73	1946	81
WASHINGTON			
W.G. Magnuson, Seattle	55	1944	12
H.M. Jackson, Everett	48	1953	1
WEST VIRGINIA			
J. Randolph, Elkins	58	1958	8
R.C. Byrd, Sophia	43	1959	23
WISCONSIN			
A. WILEY, Chippewa Falls	76	1939	44
W. Proxmire, Madison	45	1957	10
WYOMING			
G.W. McGee, Laramie	45	1959	0
J.J. Hickey, Cheyenne	49	1961	-

*Acquired during House service.

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Member and Home City	Age	Service Began	ACA
ALABAMA			
1 F.W. Boykin, Mobile	75	1935	25
2 G.M. Grant, Troy	63	1938	32
3 G.W. Andrews, Union Springs	54	1944	37
4 K.A. Roberts, Anniston	48	1951	17
5 A. Rains, Gadsden	58	1945	8
6 A.I. Selden, Jr. Greensboro	39	1953	30
7 C. Elliott, Jasper	47	1949	9
8 R.E. Jones, Scottsboro	48	1947	10
9 G. Huddleston, Jr. Birmingham	40	1955	23
ALASKA			
R.J. Rivers, Fairbanks	57	1959	0
ARIZONA			
1 J.J. RHODES, Mesa	44	1953	84
2 Vacant			
ARKANSAS			
1 E.C. Gathings, West Memphis	57	1939	41
2 W.D. Mills, Kensett	51	1939	25
3 J.W. Trimble, Berryville	66	1945	8
4 O. Harris, El Dorado	57	1941	28
5 T.D. Alford, Little Rock	44	1959	25
6 W.F. Norrell, Monticello	64	1939	38
CALIFORNIA - Los Angeles			
15 G.L. McDONOUGH, Los Angeles	65	1945	92
16 A.E. BELL, JR. Beverly Hills	46	1961	-
17 C.R. King, Los Angeles	62	1942	3
18 C. HOSMER, Long Beach	45	1953	76
19 C. Holifield, Montebello	57	1943	14
20 H.A. SMITH, Glendale	51	1957	100
21 E.W. HIESTAND, Altadena	72	1953	100
22 J.C. Corman, Van Nuys	40	1961	-
23 C. Doyle, South Gate	73	1949	6
24 G.P. LIPSCOMB, Los Angeles	45	1953	100
25 J.H. ROUSSELOT, San Gabriel	31	1961	-
26 J. Roosevelt, Los Angeles	53	1955	5
CALIFORNIA - Outside Los Angeles			
1 C.W. Miller, Corte Madera	44	1959	0
2 H.T. Johnson, Roseville	53	1959	0
3 J.E. Moss, Jr., Sacramento	47	1953	5
4 W.S. MAILLIARD, San Francisco	43	1953	78
5 **J.F. Shelley, San Francisco**	55	1949	6
6 J.F. BALDWIN, JR., Martinez	45	1955	45
7 J. Cohelan, Berkeley	46	1959	6
8 G.P. Miller, Alameda	69	1945	6
9 J.A. YOUNGER, San Mateo	67	1953	90
10 C.S. GUBSER, Gilroy	44	1953	81
11 J.J. McFall, Manteca	42	1957	8
12 B.F. Sisk, Fresno	50	1955	5
13 C.M. TEAGUE, Ojai	51	1955	84
14 H.F. Hagen, Hanford	46	1953	16
27 H.R. Sheppard, Yucaipa	76	1937	15
28 J.B. UTT, Santa Ana	61	1953	97
29 D.S. Saund, Westmorland	61	1957	5
30 R.C. WILSON, Chula Vista	44	1953	88
COLORADO			
1 B.G. Rogers, Denver	60	1951	18
2 P.H. DOMINICK, Englewood	45	1961	-
3 J.E. CHENOWETH, Trinidad	63	1951	73
4 W.N. Aspinall, Palisade	64	1949	8
CONNECTICUT			
1 E.Q. Daddario, Hartford	42	1959	22
2 H. SEELY-BROWN, JR. Pomfret Center	52	1961	-
3 R.N. Giaimo, North Haven	41	1959	17
4 A.W. SIBAL, Norwalk	39	1961	-
5 J.S. Monagan, Waterbury	49	1959	24
AL - F. Kowalski, Meriden	53	1959	5
DELAWARE			
H.B. McDowell, Jr. Middletown	54	1959	11
FLORIDA			
1 W.C. CRAMER, St. Petersburg	38	1955	89
2 C.E. Bennett, Jacksonville	50	1949	35
3 R.L.F. Sikes, Crestview	54	1945	32
4 D.B. Fascell, Miami	43	1955	25
5 A.S. Herlong, Jr., Leesburg	51	1949	65
6 P.G. Rogers, West Palm Beach	39	1955	48
7 J.A. Haley, Sarasota	62	1953	77
8 D.R. Matthews, Gainesville	53	1953	38
GEORGIA			
1 G.E. Hagan, Sylvania	44	1961	-
2 J.L. Pilcher, Meigs	62	1953	37
3 E.L. Forrester, Leesburg	64	1951	51
4 J.J. Flynt, Jr., Griffin	46	1954	67
5 J.C. Davis, Stone Mountain	65	1947	62
6 C. Vinson, Milledgeville	77	1914	42
7 J.W. Davis, Summerville	44	1961	-
8 Mrs. I.F. Blitch, Homerville	48	1955	33
9 P.M. Landrum, Jasper	51	1953	42
10 R.G. Stephens, Jr., Athens	47	1961	-
HAWAII			
D.K. Inouye, Honolulu	36	1959	-
IDAHO			
1 Mrs. G.B. Pfost, Nampa	54	1953	13
2 R.R. Harding, Blackfoot	31	1961	-
ILLINOIS - Chicago			
1 W.L. Dawson, Chicago	74	1943	0
2 B. O'Hara, Chicago	78	1953	8
3 W.T. Murphy, Chicago	61	1959	5
4 E.J. DERWINSKI, Chicago	34	1959	93
5 J.C. Kluczynski, Chicago	64	1951	10
6 T.J. O'Brien, Chicago	82	1943	10
7 R.V. Libonati, Chicago	60	1957	3
8 D.D. Rostenkowski, Chicago	33	1959	0
9 S.R. Yates, Chicago	51	1949	15
10 H.R. COLLIER, Berwyn	45	1957	97
11 R.C. Pucinski, Chicago	41	1959	5
12 E.R. Finnegan, Chicago	55	1961	-
13 MRS. M.S. CHURCH, Evanston	68	1951	95
ILLINOIS - Outside Chicago			
14 E.J. HOFFMAN, Wheaton	61	1959	100
15 N.M. MASON, Oglesby	78	1937	96
16 J.B. ANDERSON, Rockford	38	1961	-
17 L.C. ARENDS, Melvin	65	1935	89
18 R.H. MICHEL, Peoria	37	1957	94
19 R.B. CHIPERFIELD, Canton	61	1939	92
20 P. FINDLEY, Pittsfield	39	1961	-
21 P.F. Mack, Jr., Carlinville	44	1949	3
22 W.L. SPRINGER, Champaign	51	1951	83
23 G.E. Shipley, Olney	33	1959	0
24 M. Price, East St. Louis	56	1945	0
25 K.J. Gray, West Frankfort	36	1955	11
INDIANA			
1 R.J. Madden, Gary	68	1943	10
2 C.A. HALLECK, Rensselaer	60	1935	87
3 J. Brademas, South Bend	33	1959	0
4 E.R. ADAIR, Fort Wayne	53	1951	97
5 Vacant			
6 R.L. ROUDEBUSH, Noblesville	42	1961	-
7 W.G. BRAY, Martinsville	57	1951	69
8 W.K. Denton, Evansville	64	1955	17
9 E. WILSON, Bedford	54	1961	-
10 R. HARVEY, New Castle	59	1961	-
11 D.C. BRUCE, Indianapolis	39	1961	-
IOWA			
1 F. SCHWENGEL, Davenport	53	1955	77
2 J.E. BROMWELL, Cedar Rapids	40	1961	-
3 H.R. GROSS, Waterloo	61	1949	90
4 J. KYL, Bloomfield	41	1960	-
5 N. Smith, Altoona	40	1959	16
6 M. Coad, Boone	36	1957	8
7 B.F. JENSEN, Exira	68	1939	82
8 C.B. HOEVEN, Alton	65	1943	89
KANSAS			
1 W.H. AVERY, Wakefield	49	1955	79
2 R.F. ELLSWORTH, Lawrence	34	1961	-
3 W.L. McVEY, Independence	38	1961	-
4 G.E. SHRIVER, Wichita	48	1961	-
5 **J.F. Breeding, Rolla**	59	1957	18
6 R. DOLE, Russell	37	1961	-
KENTUCKY			
1 F.A. Stubblefield, Murray	53	1959	11
2 W.H. Natcher, Bowling Green	51	1953	18
3 F.W. Burke, Louisville	40	1959	6
4 F. Chelf, Lebanon	53	1945	18
5 B. Spence, Fort Thomas	86	1931	11
6 J.C. Watts, Nicholasville	58	1951	24
7 C.D. Perkins, Hindman	48	1949	8
8 E. SILER, Williamsburg	60	1955	79
LOUISIANA			
1 F.E. Hebert, New Orleans	59	1941	42
2 H. Boggs, New Orleans	46	1947	15
3 E.E. Willis, St. Martinville	56	1949	34
4 O. Brooks, Shreveport	63	1937	39
5 O.E. Passman, Monroe	60	1947	31
6 J.H. Morrison, Hammond	52	1943	15
7 T.A. Thompson, Ville Platte	44	1953	31
8 H.B. McSween, Alexandria	34	1959	50
MAINE			
1 P.A. GARLAND, Cape Elizabeth	37	1961	-
2 S.R. TUPPER, Augusta	39	1961	-
3 C.G. McINTIRE, Perham	52	1951	88
MARYLAND			
1 T.F. Johnson, Berlin	51	1959	31
2 D.B. Brewster, Glyndon	37	1959	32
3 E.A. Garmatz, Baltimore	57	1947	22
4 G.H. Fallon, Baltimore	58	1945	39
5 R.E. Lankford, Annapolis	46	1955	25
6 C.McC. MATHIAS, JR., Frederick	38	1961	-
7 S.N. Friedel, Baltimore	62	1953	17
MASSACHUSETTS			
1 S.O. CONTE, Pittsfield	39	1959	74
2 E.P. Boland, Springfield	49	1953	30
3 P.J. Philbin, Clinton	62	1943	18
4 H.D. Donohue, Worcester	59	1947	18
5 F.B. MORSE, Lowell	39	1961	-
6 W.H. BATES, Salem	43	1950	85
7 T.J. Lane, Lawrence	62	1941	18
8 T.H. Macdonald, Malden	43	1955	24
9 H. KEITH, West Bridgewater	45	1959	95
10 L. CURTIS, Boston	67	1953	75
11 T.P. O'Neill, Jr., Cambridge	48	1953	11
12 J.W. McCormack, Dorchester	69	1928	0
13 J.A. Burke, Milton	50	1959	11
14 J.W. MARTIN, JR., **North Attleboro**	76	1925	81
MICHIGAN - Detroit			
1 T.M. Machrowicz, Hamtramck	61	1951	3
13 C.C. Diggs, Jr., Detroit	38	1955	6
14 L.C. Rabaut, Grosse Pointe Park	74	1949	15
15 J.D. Dingell, Detroit	34	1955	11
16 J. Lesinski, Dearborn	46	1951	21
17 Mrs. M.W. Griffiths, Detroit	48	1955	16
MICHIGAN - Outside Detroit			
2 G. MEADER, Ann Arbor	53	1951	94
3 A.E. JOHANSEN, Battle Creek	55	1955	97
4 C.E. HOFFMAN, Allegan	85	1935	97
5 G.R. FORD, JR., Grand Rapids	47	1949	88
6 C.E. CHAMBERLAIN, East Lansing	43	1957	84
7 J.G. O'Hara, Utica	35	1959	5
8 J. HARVEY, Saginaw	38	1961	-
9 R.P. GRIFFIN, Traverse City	37	1957	84
10 E.A. CEDERBERG, Bay City	42	1953	97
11 V.A. KNOX, Sault Ste. Marie	61	1953	74
12 **J.B. BENNETT, Ontonagon**	57	1947	48
18 W.S. BROOMFIELD, Royal Oak	38	1957	80
MINNESOTA			
1 A.H. QUIE, Dennison	37	1958	87
2 **A. NELSEN, Hutchinson**	56	1959	100
3 C. MacGREGOR, Plymouth Village	38	1961	-
4 J.E. Karth, St. Paul	38	1959	0
5 W.H. JUDD, Minneapolis	62	1943	80
6 F. Marshall, Grove City	54	1949	39
7 H.C. ANDERSEN, Tyler	63	1939	79
8 J.A. Blatnik, Chisholm	49	1947	14
9 O. LANGEN, Kennedy	48	1959	89
MISSISSIPPI			
1 T.G. Abernethy, Okolona	57	1943	46
2 J.L. Whitten, Charleston	50	1941	46
3 F.E. Smith, Greenwood	42	1951	24
4 J.B. Williams, Raymond	42	1947	58
5 A. Winstead, Philadelphia	57	1943	47
6 W.M. Colmer, Pascagoula	70	1933	50
MISSOURI			
1 F.M. Karsten, St. Louis	48	1947	3
2 T.B. CURTIS, Webster Groves	49	1951	89
3 Mrs. L.K. Sullivan, St. Louis	57	1953	8
4 W.J. Randall, Independence	51	1959	0
5 R. Bolling, Kansas City	44	1949	3
6 W.R. Hull, Jr., Weston	54	1955	41
7 D.G. HALL, Springfield	50	1961	-
8 R. Ichord, Houston	34	1961	-
9 C. Cannon, Elsberry	81	1923	42
10 P.C. Jones, Kennett	59	1948	36
11 M.M. Moulder, Camdenton	56	1949	17
MONTANA			
1 A. Olsen, Helena	44	1961	-
2 J.F. BATTIN, Billings	35	1961	-
NEBRASKA			
1 P. WEAVER, Falls City	41	1955	70
2 G.C. CUNNINGHAM, Omaha	48	1957	85
3 R.F. BEERMANN, Dakota City	48	1961	-
4 D. MARTIN, Kearney	53	1961	-
NEVADA			
W.S. Baring, Reno	49	1957	18
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
1 C.E. MERROW, Center Ossipee	54	1943	35
2 P. BASS, Peterborough	48	1955	83
NEW JERSEY			
1 W.T. CAHILL, Collingswood	48	1959	83
2 M.W. GLENN, Margate	57	1957	88
3 J.C. AUCHINCLOSS, Rumson	76	1943	79
4 F. Thompson, Jr., Trenton	42	1955	13
5 P. FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., Morristown	45	1953	78

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	Name and Home City	Age	Service Began	ACA
6	MRS. F.P. DWYER, Elizabeth	58	1957	68
7	W.B. WIDNALL, Saddle River	54	1950	76
8	C.S. Joelson, Paterson	44	1961	-
9	F.C. OSMERS, JR., Tenafly	53	1951	74
10	P.W. Rodino, Jr., Newark	51	1949	13
11	H.J. Addonizio, Newark	46	1949	15
12	G.M. WALLHAUSER, Maplewood	60	1959	81
13	C.E. Gallagher, Bayonne	39	1959	11
14	D.V. Daniels, Jersey City	52	1959	11
	NEW MEXICO			
AL	J.M. Montoya, Santa Fe	45	1957	3
AL	T.G. Morris, Tucumcari	41	1959	16
	NEW YORK - New York City			
4	S. HALPERN, Forest Hills	47	1959	63
5	J.P. Addabbo, Ozone Park	35	1961	-
6	L. Holtzman, Rego Park	47	1953	16
7	J.J. Delaney, Long Island City	59	1949	18
8	V.L. Anfuso, Brooklyn	55	1955	4
9	E.J. Keogh, Brooklyn	53	1937	6
10	Mrs. E.F. Kelly, Brooklyn	54	1949	17
11	E. Celler, Brooklyn	72	1923	12
12	H.L. Carey, Brooklyn	41	1961	-
13	A.J. Multer, Brooklyn	60	1947	8
14	J.J. Rooney, Brooklyn	57	1944	10
15	J.H. RAY, Staten Island	74	1953	93
16	A.C. Powell, New York City	52	1945	32
17	J.V. LINDSAY, New York City	39	1959	79
18	A.E. Santangelo, New York City	48	1957	5
19	L. Farbstein, New York City	58	1957	12
20	W.F. Ryan, New York City	38	1961	-
21	H. Zelenko, New York City	54	1955	9
22	J.C. Healey, New York City	51	1956	8
23	J.H. Gilbert, New York City	40	1960	-
24	C.A. Buckley, New York City	70	1935	0
25	P.A. FINO, New York City	47	1953	54
	NEW YORK - Outside New York City			
1	O.G. Pike, Riverhead	39	1961	-
2	S.B. DEROUNIAN, Roslyn	42	1953	97
3	F.J. BECKER, Lynbrook	61	1953	97
26	E.B. DOOLEY, Mamaroneck	54	1957	73
27	R. R. BARRY, Yonkers	45	1959	95
28	MRS. K. ST. GEORGE, Tuxedo Pk.	64	1947	88
29	J.E. WHARTON, Richmondville	61	1951	87
30	L.W. O'Brien, Albany	60	1952	33
31	C.J. KING, Saratoga Springs	56	1961	-
32	S.S. Stratton, Schenectady	44	1959	37
33	C.E. KILBURN, Malone	67	1940	88
34	A. PIRNIE, New Hartford	57	1959	100
35	R.W. RIEHLMAN, Tully	61	1947	89
36	J. TABER, Auburn	80	1923	92
37	H.W. ROBISON, Owego	45	1958	100
38	MRS. J.McC. WEIS, Rochester	59	1959	89
39	H.C. OSTERTAG, Attica	64	1951	93
40	W.E. MILLER, Olcott	46	1951	96
41	T.J. Dulski, Buffalo	45	1959	26
42	J.R. PILLION, Lakeview	56	1953	97
43	C.E. GOODELL, Jamestown	34	1959	100
	NORTH CAROLINA			
1	H.C. Bonner, Washington	69	1940	30
2	L.H. Fountain, Tarboro	47	1953	40
3	D.N. Henderson, Wallace	39	1961	-
4	H.D. Cooley, Nashville	63	1934	28
5	R.J. Scott, Danbury	55	1957	51
6	H.R. Kornegay, Greensboro	36	1961	-
7	A. Lennon, Wilmington	54	1957	41
8	A.P. Kitchin, Wadesboro	52	1957	49
9	H.Q. Alexander, Kannapolis	49	1953	51
10	C.R. JONAS, Lincolnton	56	1953	90
11	B.L. Whitener, Gastonia	45	1957	50
12	R.A. Taylor, Black Mountain	50	1960	-
	NORTH DAKOTA			
AL	D.L. SHORT, Medora	57	1959	95
AL	H. NYGAARD, Enderlin	54	1961	-
	OHIO			
1	G.H. SCHERER, Cincinnati	54	1953	100
2	D.D. CLANCY, Cincinnati	39	1961	-
3	P.F. SCHENCK, Dayton	61	1951	98
4	W.M. McCULLOCH, Piqua	59	1947	95
5	D.L. LATTA, Bowling Green	40	1959	89
6	W.H. HARSHA, JR., Portsmouth	39	1961	-
7	C.J. BROWN, Blanchester	67	1939	97
8	J.E. BETTS, Findlay	56	1951	95
9	T.L. Ashley, Waterville	37	1955	18
10	W.H. Moeller, Lancaster	50	1959	19
11	R.E. Cook, Kent	40	1959	12
12	S.L. DEVINE, Columbus	45	1959	100
13	C.A. MOSHER, Oberlin	54	1961	-
14	W.H. AYRES, Akron	44	1951	85
15	T.V. MOOREHEAD, Zanesville	62	1961	-
16	F.T. BOW, Canton	59	1951	97
17	J.M. ASHBROOK, Johnstown	32	1961	-
18	W.L. Hays, Flushing	49	1949	14
19	M.J. Kirwan, Youngstown	74	1937	19
20	M. A. Feighan, Cleveland	55	1943	26
21	C.A. Vanik, Cleveland	47	1955	29
22	MRS. F.P. BOLTON, Lyndhurst	75	1940	94
23	W.E. MINSHALL, JR. Cleveland	49	1955	100
	OKLAHOMA			
1	P. BELCHER, Enid	61	1951	86
2	E. Edmondson, Muskogee	41	1953	8
3	C.B. Albert, McAlester	52	1947	8
4	T. Steed, Shawnee	56	1949	22
5	J. Jarman, Oklahoma City	45	1951	37
6	V. Wickersham, Mangum	54	1961	-
	OREGON			
1	W. NORBLAD, Stayton	52	1946	73
2	A.C. Ullman, Baker	46	1957	3
3	Mrs. E. Green, Portland	51	1955	14
4	E.R. DURNO, Medford	61	1961	-
	PENNSYLVANIA - Philadelphia			
1	W.A. Barrett, Philadelphia	64	1949	11
2	Mrs. K.E. Granahan, Phila.	54	1956	14
3	J.A. Byrne, Philadelphia	54	1953	13
4	R.N.C. Nix, Philadelphia	55	1958	14
5	W.J. Green, Jr., Phila.	50	1949	12
6	H. Toll, Philadelphia	53	1959	6
	PENNSYLVANIA - Pittsburgh			
27	J.G. FULTON, Pittsburgh	57	1945	44
28	W.S. Moorhead, Pittsburgh	37	1959	0
29	R.J. CORBETT, Pittsburgh	55	1945	50
30	E.J. Holland, Pittsburgh	67	1956	8
	PENNSYLVANIA - Outside Big Cities			
7	W.H. MILLIKEN, JR., Sharon Hill	63	1959	95
8	W.S. CURTIN, Morrisville	55	1957	63
9	P.B. DAGUE, Downingtown	62	1947	89
10	W.W. SCRANTON, Dalton	43	1961	-
11	D.J. Flood, Wilkes-Barre	57	1955	13
12	I.D. FENTON, Mahanoy City	71	1939	77
13	R.S. SCHWEIKER, Lansdale	34	1961	-
14	G.M. Rhodes, Reading	62	1949	13
15	F.E. Walter, Easton	66	1933	28
16	W.M. MUMMA, Harrisburg	70	1951	93
17	H.T. SCHNEEBELI, Williamsport	53	1960	-
18	J.I. WHALLEY, Windber	58	1961	-
19	G.A. GOODLING, Loganville	64	1961	-
20	J.E. VAN ZANDT, Altoona	62	1947	63
21	J.H. Dent, Jeannette	52	1958	17
22	J.P. SAYLOR, Johnstown	52	1949	61
23	L.H. GAVIN, Oil City	67	1943	70
24	C.D. KEARNS, Farrell	60	1947	65
25	F.M. Clark, Bessemer	45	1955	28
26	T.E. Morgan, Fredericktown	54	1945	11
	RHODE ISLAND			
1	F.J. St. Germain, Woonsocket	32	1961	-
2	J.E. Fogarty, Harmony	47	1945	27
	SOUTH CAROLINA			
1	L.M. Rivers, Charleston	55	1941	37
2	J.J. Riley, Sumter	65	1951	51
3	W.J.B. Dorn, Greenwood	44	1951	56
4	R.T. Ashmore, Greenville	56	1953	58
5	R.W. Hemphill, Chester	45	1957	45
6	J.L. McMillan, Florence	62	1939	47
	SOUTH DAKOTA			
	B. REIFEL, Aberdeen	54	1961	-
2	E.Y. BERRY, McLaughlin	58	1951	85
	TENNESSEE			
1	B.C. REECE, Johnson City	71	1951	80
2	H.H. BAKER, Huntsville	59	1951	58
3	J.B. Frazier, Jr., Chattanooga	70	1949	23
4	J.L. Evins, Smithville	50	1947	31
5	J.C. Loser, Nashville	68	1957	33
6	R. Bass, Pulaski	42	1955	16
7	T. Murray, Jackson	66	1943	67
8	R.A. Everett, Union City	45	1958	26
9	C. Davis, Memphis	63	1940	26
	TEXAS			
1	W. Patman, Texarkana	67	1929	18
2	J. Brooks, Beaumont	28	1953	13
	L. Beckworth, Gladewater	47	1957	20
4	S. Rayburn, Bonham	79	1913	-
5	B. ALGER, Dallas	42	1955	100
6	O.E. Teague College Station	50	1946	34
7	J. Dowdy, Athens	48	1952	56
8	A. Thomas, Houston	62	1937	23
9	C.W. Thompson, Galveston	64	1947	20
10	H. Thornberry, Austin	52	1949	19
11	W.R. Poage, Waco	61	1937	33
12	J.C. Wright, Jr., Weatherford	38	1955	28
13	F.N. Ikard, Wichita Falls	46	1951	29
14	J. Young, Corpus Christi	44	1957	26
15	J.M. Kilgore, McAllen	42	1955	58
16	J.T. Rutherford, Odessa	40	1955	30
17	O. Burleson, Anson	54	1947	48
18	W.E. Rogers, Pampa	52	1951	33
19	G.H. Mahon, Lubbock	60	1935	48
20	P.J. Kilday, San Antonio	60	1939	23
21	O.C. Fisher, San Angelo	57	1943	51
22	R.R. Casey, Houston	45	1959	47
	UTAH			
1	M.B. Peterson, Ogden	54	1961	-
2	D.S. King, Salt Lake City	43	1959	11
	VERMONT			
	R.T. STAFFORD, Rutland City	47	1961	-
	VIRGINIA			
1	T.N. Downing, Newport News	41	1959	47
2	P. Hardy, Jr., Churchland	57	1947	45
3	J.V. Gary, Richmond	68	1945	78
4	W.M. Abbitt, Appomattox	52	1948	75
5	W.M. Tuck, South Boston	64	1953	77
6	R.H. POFF, Radford	37	1953	98
7	B.P. Harrison, Winchester	56	1946	75
8	H.W. Smith, Broad Run	77	1931	73
9	W.P. Jennings, Marion	41	1955	25
10	J.T. BROYHILL, Arlington	41	1953	86
	WASHINGTON			
1	T.M. PELLY, Seattle	58	1953	83
2	J. WESTLAND, Everett	56	1953	86
3	Mrs. J.B. Hansen, Cathlamet	53	1961	-
4	MRS. C. MAY, Yakima	46	1959	88
5	W.F. HORAN, Wenatchee	62	1943	59
6	T.C. TOLLEFSON, Tacoma	59	1947	50
7	D.H. Magnuson, Seattle	49	1953	8
	WEST VIRGINIA			
1	A.A. MOORE, JR., Glen Dale	37	1957	57
2	H.O. Staggers, Keyser	53	1949	21
3	C.M. Bailey, Clarksburg	74	1949	22
4	K. Hechler, Huntington	46	1959	26
5	Mrs. E. Kee, Bluefield	61	1951	19
6	J.M. Slack, Jr., Charleston	45	1959	6
	WISCONSIN			
1	H.C. SCHADEBERG, Burlington	47	1961	-
2	R.W. Kastenmeier, Watertown	36	1959	11
3	V.W. THOMSON, Richland Center	55	1961	-
4	C.J. Zablocki, Milwaukee	48	1949	15
5	H.S. Reuss, Milwaukee	48	1955	3
6	W.K. VAN PELT, Fond du Lac	55	1951	91
7	M.R. LAIRD, Marshfield	38	1953	92
8	J.W. BYRNES, Green Bay	47	1945	93
9	L.R. Johnson, Black River Falls	59	1953	10
10	A.E. O'KONSKI, Mercer	53	1943	38
	WYOMING			
	W.H. HARRISON, Sheridan	64	1961	-

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 410 First Street, S. E. Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "ROSTER OF CONGRESSMEN" at $_____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles add 1c per copy; for airmail add 2c per copy.

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Organized Efforts Win Elections

By Raymond Moley

While Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote an essay on politics, I am sure he knew little of the practical side of that ancient art. If he had, he would not have applied to elections his comment about the man who made a better mouse trap and who found customers beating a path through the wilderness to his door.

For in politics a fine candidate may have better issues, but without organized effort in his behalf he will lose. In politics, organization comes first; next, there is the attractiveness of the candidate; and, finally, there are appealing issues.

Without expressing at this point a comparison of Kennedy and Nixon as candidates or a preference between what they represented as issues, let us test the foregoing principle by the results of the election.

In the big states which clinched the election—New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, and Missouri—enormous majorities in the big cities crushed the rest of the state.

In Chicago, Mayor and Boss Daley whipped his field commanders to prodigious efforts. High among these sub-bosses is Congressman William Dawson, who rules Chicago's grimy South Side with a fist of iron. The Negro constituents who prevail in his congressional district give him awesome obedience. In the House of Representatives, his 18 years of service have given him the chairmanship of the important Government Operations Committee.

Similar commanders appear in many of the other major cities. All these forces operated with practiced skill. Those states were vital to the national ticket. The margin of votes was in the cities and organizations which got out the votes.

Outstanding among the big states were two which were carried by Nixon. They were Ohio and California. In both states the Republican Party suffered crushing defeats in 1958. The shock was so great that Republican leaders were almost in despair after the election. But in both cases a few dedicated people went to work before the year 1958 ended.

While I live in New York and vote there, I know more of Ohio and California than any of the other states. Both were interesting examples of confidence in organization.

In Ohio the job of rebuilding fell upon State Chairman Ray Bliss. His problem and that of many Republican workers who lived in Cleveland was to keep down the certain Kennedy majority in that city and at the same time work in the other 87 counties to create an offset.

On the basis of a heavy Democratic registration stimulated by the efforts of labor's COPE, the Democratic aim was to get a Kennedy majority of not less than 250,000 in Cuyahoga County. When I visited Cleveland two weeks before the election, Republican leaders told me that they hoped to cut the Kennedy majority there down to 100,000. They did not accomplish that miracle, but they did succeed in reducing the majority to less than 150,000. The operations elsewhere in the state made up for that margin, and the state went to Nixon-Lodge by 270,000.

In California the great prize is the immense vote in Los Angeles County. With a new county chairman, former Congressman Pat Hillings, reinforced by a volunteer group, the Republican Associates, the incredible happened. Of the Republicans registered, 97.5 per cent were gotten to the polls, while more than 100,000 registered Democrats voted for Nixon-Lodge. Thus of all the major urban areas in the nation, the Kennedy plurality was the smallest—a mere 21,321. Organized effort elsewhere in the state easily made up the difference.

The lesson is clear. Organized efforts win elections. Neither candidates nor issues can win without organized, year-around efforts to get out the vote. This is the hard lesson that the Republican Party over the nation must learn.

Federal Power Rebuffed In Oregon Dam Project

From the Indianapolis Star

There is a refreshing note in word of a new battle over construction of a big hydroelectric power plant on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon. This new note is that neither contender in the fight has plans to tap the Federal taxpayer to pay the bill.

The locale is not far from the Hell's Canyon reach of the Snake, over which a long and bitter fight was waged recently between a private power company and the promoters of a Federal dam project. The private company won out, and the Federal taxpayers were thereby saved in the neighborhood of a half billion dollars at the outset, plus annual taxes the private firm will pay on its earnings from the Hell's Canyon development.

The new fight is over the Nez Perce and Mountain Sheep dam sites, downstream from Hell's Canyon. This time the contenders are two combines, one of private power companies and the other publicly owned utility districts. Whichever wins, the investment will be made with locally raised funds.

This is one more situation which gives the lie to the frequently heard argument that the Federal government must undertake these great projects or else they will not be done. Here is competition for the privilege of carrying out a development project which is comparable in size and cost with many of the bigger Federal dam projects. There are ways to do such things, without piling the burden on the Federal taxpayer's shoulders.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVIII, No. 4 — Section 2-a HUMAN EVENTS January 27, 1961

The Forgotten American Part I

A Statement of Proposed Republican Principles, Programs and Objectives

BY THE HONORABLE BARRY GOLDWATER
Senator from Arizona

During the past quarter of a century, America has become a society of competing pressure groups. The feeling has become almost universal that the individual by himself and unorganized—is virtually helpless to achieve what are, at bottom, individual goals —economic well-being generally, a rising standard of living, improved education, cultural development, and dignified human treatment in social and economic relationships.

Energetic, but often self-seeking servitors of these individual wants have during the period formed, or immesurably strengthened, powerful organizations geared to achieve material gains for the individual which he finds it increasingly difficult to bring about by himself. Hence the flourishing of such organizations as labor unions, racial groups, civil liberties groups, consumer groups, nationality groups, cooperatives, educational associations, and even so-called cultural and artistic groups.

To the degree that such organizations successfully render desired services to their members, but remain within a limited and circumscribed sphere of activity, they can be viewed as legitimate instruments of the individual, doing collectively what cannot be done nearly so well by the isolated individual acting alone.

But it cannot be emphasized strongly enough, that these pressure group organizations often serve to aggrandize their own leaders and bureaucracy as well, sometimes at the expense of the membership. And, what is more important, all of these pressure group organizations even when functioning properly serve only a part of the individual's needs. In an ominous development, however, many of these organizations increasingly act as though they were empowered to serve the total man, the individual member in all his manifold aspects.

Thus, to take the most obvious contemporary example, the labor unions would now speak and act for the individual union member, not merely in his capacity as an employee facing management, but in his capacity as a citizen. Thus, in the name of its members, who in many cases have not been consulted, the union leadership takes official position on issues ranging from the minimum wage to U.N. action in the Congo, and endorses and supports, with money contributed from the hard earned wages of its members, favored political candidates for public office ranging from city aldermen to the Presidency itself.

It is instructive to note, parenthetically, that some labor unions, aiming at the total man, set up vacation resorts (at reduced rates), publish newspapers, establish schools, engage in cultural activities (like hiring professional choral groups), and thereby seek, also, to mold their members along predetermined cultural, intellectual and ideological lines. In all this totalistic organizational activity, the individual is often submerged, swamped and treated as a manipulable statistic. It may happen, as it almost always does, that the same individual is at once a worker, a member of a minority or religious group, a war veteran, a parent of school-age children, a member of a political party, of a fraternal order, or of a cooperative, and of course he is always a consumer. Yet some of his organizations tend more and more to speak for him as a total man, crushing his individuality and diversity through the organization's power and voice.

Even where the organization restricts its activities to narrower (and hence more legitimate) channels, the individual members are frequently opposed to large portions of the program. But they typically lack the time, the energy, the resources, or the courage (sometimes it takes heroic audacity), to buck the machine—to oppose the organization's leadership and bureaucracy.

So serious has this development become that on November 20, 1960, the Catholic bishops of the United States devoted their annual statement to decrying this situation. The statement opens by pointing out that:

"The history of achievements of America stands as a monument to the personal responsibility of free men. Our institutions and our industry, the fruit of the American sense of responsibility, have in the past inspired, guided and helped many other nations of the world. If our future is to be worthy of our past, if the fruit of America's promise is not to wither before it has reached full maturity, our present preeminent need is to reaffirm the sense of individual obligation, to place clearly before ourselves the foundation on which personal responsibility rests, to determine the causes of its decay and to seek the means by which it can be revived."

It then calls for a renewal of the sense of personal responsibility, initiative, and of individual obligation; it deprecates the inordinate demand for benefits to be secured through organization pressures; it is critical of placing excessive and constant reliance on the U.N. and asks for objective evaluation of the moral aspects of U.N. activity; it laments the widespread cynical reaction to the revelations by the McClellan rackets committee of dishonesty, waste, and malfeasance in labor relations; it speaks out against the growing conformity of mechanization imposed on individuals by organizations, and the favored treatment increasingly being given to these anonymous, organizational men; and it reasserts the worth and dignity of the individual when it declares that "even the most universal evil and the threatened mechanization of man can be made to yield before the just and determined wills of individual persons."

Americans largely fall into one of four categories with respect to pressure group organizations: (1) they may be truly voluntary members agreeing with all or most of the policies enunciated by their leaders; or (2) they may be pressured or forced by economic necessity into joining the pressure organizations, agreeing only partially or not at all with the official policies; or (3) they may successfully resist joining such organizations; or (4) finally, as members of the most numerous ethnic or religious groupings of the Nation, they may consider it unnecessary and even humiliating to organize themselves as do the minority or so-called underdog groups.

All of which means that there are literally scores of millions of Americans who, are either outside the organized pressure groups or find themselves represented by organizations with whose policies they disagree in whole or in part. These millions are the silent Americans, who, thus isolated, cannot find voice against the mammoth organizations which mercilessly pressure their own membership, the Congress, and society as a whole for objectives which these silent ones do not want. They thereby become the forgotten Americans despite the fact that they constitute the majority of our people.

The Republican party in this era in which so many pressure groups are seeking to dominate the total man is the vehicle and the voice for the dragooned and ignored individual, the forgotten American. It too recognizes that those private activities which are essential to the successful functioning of a modern society have tended to become institutionalized in huge organizational units which themselves growing larger with each passing year, continuously narrow the area in which the individual may act freely, decisively, and effectively. The fundamental problem which confronts the Republic is to find the means to protect individual freedom, action, and responsibility without hampering or destroying those processes

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

REPRINTED FROM
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, VOL. 107, NO. 7

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and techniques which a modern industrial society must employ if it is to survive and develop.

The phrase, "to protect individual freedom, action and responsibility" does not, in this context, refer to those measures which have been adopted in the past quarter of a century intended to protect our people against the hazards, risks, and vicissitudes of economic life. No nation in all history has achieved the degree of economic security for the overwhelming majority of its citizens which has been reached by the United States in the 20th century. Unfortunately, during this development, little thought has been given, and less action has been taken, to help the individual to secure, in his individual capacity, the greatest possible scope for effective personal activity.

Increasingly, the vital decisions are being made either directly through private organizational action or as a result of political and social influences and pressures exercised by organizations on government. Many of these organizations within the limits of their legitimate goals and functions, are essential to the maintenance of our highly productive economy or for the economic protection of the people whom they represent. Nevertheless, inherent in the very nature of organization itself is the inevitable tendency to oligarchy and bureaucracy, and toward suppression of individual initiative and personal responsibility, even where such suppression is benevolently motivated and applied for the more effective attainment of humanitarian goals. The good of the organization tends to become the predominant consideration while the individual member grows more rapidly anonymous, an increasingly helpless automaton unable, and eventually unwilling, to exercise free choice and personal responsibility.

"A fresh evocation of the principle and practice of personal responsibility can revivify our society and help to stem the seemingly inexorable march toward the automation of human beings and the steady loss of that freedom which is man's distinctive attribute. It will cure the mental lethargy and inertia which permit organizations to usurp, mainly, by default, the rights of their members. It will stimulate a self-reliance which will automatically restore the balance between freedom and security. It will reject unwarranted pressure from groups that seek unjustly to aggrandize their power and will restrict them to their lawful end." *

Inasmuch as the Federal Government has by its actions, often at the cost of weakening State and local government as well as private and community life, contributed substantially to the growth and development not only of its power, but to the expansion and strength of private organizational power, the Republican Party believes that the Federal Government must begin to consider and adopt measures to design to halt this dehumanizing trend in our society. We therefore set forth the following principles and proposals as a fundamental guide for governmental action on the Federal level, as a means for giving voice to the suppressed views and feelings of the millions of forgotten Americans who constitute the substantial majority of our society.

I. INFLATION

During the past 8 years of the Republican administration, the Nation has enjoyed unparalleled economic prosperity. Never in our history have there been so many jobs, have so many people been employed at high wages and in skilled occupations. Never have so many of our children completed not only high school but college as well, thereby acquiring the higher skills which generally bring greater economic rewards. But what is frequently overlooked is that during those same years the private savings, insurance holdings, and pension funds of our citizens have grown to enormous proportions never before attained. What is more, the policies of the Republican administration have been largely successful in warding off inflation and in thus safeguarding against any serious decline in value of these tremendous private resources.

In November of 1960, private saving and insurance in the United States reached an alltime high of almost $307 billion. At the same time participation in private pension plans (exclusive of social security) has grown to enormous proportions. In December of 1960, some 20 million persons were enrolled in private pension plans with more than $40 billion set aside in trust or with life insurance companies to meet the benefits expected by 25,000 plans. (These figures do not include other types of private benefit plans such as health insurance and other forms of fringe benefits.)

These accumulations of private savings insurance, and pension funds are a tribute to the strength and persistence of the traditional American ideal that the basic responsibility for safeguarding himself and his family against the hazards of old age, sickness and economic disaster, and for providing his children with the opportunity for education and acquiring higher economic skills rests primarily with the individual. Thus the protection of these private savings, insurance and pension funds presently constitutes the most important domestic problem facing our Federal Government.

The Democratic Party platform is an ominous threat to the financial security of the American people, the overwhelming majority of whom now possesses substantial savings, insurance and pension rights. It threatens not only those who live on fixed incomes in the present, but the future of every family which through thrift and present sacrifice has sought to make provision for the future. The reckless and spendthrift promises of the Democratic platform could be carried out only by means of a program of Federal spending so tremendous as to require either an enormous increase in taxation or a policy of deficit spending leading to uncontrolled inflation.

Few are so gullible as to believe that the new administration would dare to implement these promises by means of increased taxation. The tax burden our Nation bears is already so heavy as to verge on the intolerable. Any substantial increase would of necessity be borne by all of our people, not merely the few with the larger incomes. No surer prescription for the political defeat of any administration can be imagined, and so we may rest assured that such an increase in taxation will not be attempted.

But to the irresponsible spenders the siren song of further Government borrowing is irresistible. Unbalanced budgets, growth of the national debt, increase in the interest the Government must pay on that debt, are as inevitable as the sequence of night and day. Inflation will run rampant, the purchasing power of the American dollar will melt away like snowdrifts in the spring sun, and our hard-working and thrifty people will watch in stupefied dismay as the value of their savings, their insurance, their pension funds diminish each day, ultimately perhaps to vanish entirely.

The presidential election of November 8, 1960, clearly indicates that a majority of the voters rejected the rash and reckless proposals of the Democratic platform. The Republican Party, therefore, despite its minority status in the Congress, pledges itself to resist with all its strength, and through every appropriate legislative procedure, any proposal which would lead to inflation and its inevitable consequence of diminishing the value of the savings, the insurance, and the pension funds of the American people. We further pledge ourselves to combat any attempt to add to the already unbearable burden of taxation which rests on our citizens unless it can clearly be shown that such new taxes are essential to the national security and that a heavy preponderance of our citizens recognize such necessity and willingly accept the additional burden.

A striking illustration of how the forgotten American feels on the subject to inflation and its disastrous consequences for him is the voting pattern in certain areas of Florida where large numbers of elderly, retired persons have taken up permanent residence.

The Republicans carried the State of Florida, but the contrast in voting between east and west coast areas of the State is startling. Thus, on the east coast, the city of Miami and the Miami Beach area were carried by Kennedy. The east coast is predominantly both the playground and the retirement area for the well-to-do and the rich. Such localities as Miami, Palm Beach, Fort Lauderdale, Boca Raton, Delray, Daytona Beach, Ormond Beach, and St. Augustine have become synonymns for wealth. Few whose sole source of income is a social security, civil service, railroad retirement, or small private pension could afford to live in those areas.

On the other hand, the Florida west (or gulf) coast, in many of its towns and cities has a tremendous concentration of retirees who fall into these categories. Gulf coast towns like St. Petersburg, Bradenton, and Clearwater, counties like Pinellas, Sarasota, and

* Statement of the Catholic bishops, op. cit.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Manatee, have enormous populations of elderly retired folk living on small fixed incomes or savings. Nevertheless, these areas were carried by NIXON, they reelected their Republican Congressman, WILLIAM C. CRAMER and what is most significant, they swept into local office practically all of the Republican candidates. Thus, Republicans won 20 of 21 races, running rampant in Pinellas County which includes St. Petersburg and Clearwater; won 21 of 22 contested races in Sarasota County, and took 10 of the 11 contested local races in Manatee County, the seat of Bradenton. What is more, a majority of the voters over 50 years of age, voted Republican in the last election.

These overwhelming Republican victories among elderly retired voters living on small incomes, demonstrates the complete failure of the spendthrift Democratic platform to attract these voters. This is especially significant because that platform held out the very bait which the Democrats so strongly believed would appeal to elderly voters—medical care for the aged. The bait was totally ineffective. To the contrary, the only reasonable inference that can be drawn from the tremendous Republican triumphs in these Florida west coast areas is that the elderly voters were scared to death of what the Democratic platform would do to the value of their small pensions, incomes, and savings, and against that fear, the promise of medical care for the aged carried not the slightest weight.

The Democrats will probably argue that most of the voters from that area are Republicans who migrated to Florida from Northern and Western States and merely continued old voting habits. Even if this were true, it doesn't minimize the significance of their refusing to fall for the promised Democratic handout. But this argument is entirely without merit. For it is equally true that Florida east coast retirees are also migrants from the North and West, and politically, they behaved quite differently. No, the important distinction between the two groups is their economic status—the well-to-do retirees of the east coast as contrasted with the most modest and even poor retirees living in the gulf towns.

II. LABOR

(a) Labor unions enjoy many special privileges and immunities under Federal law. By far the most important of these is the exclusive right to represent all the employees in the unit for purposes of collective bargaining, even if the union has been selected as bargaining agent by only a narrow majority, which in many circumstances under our existing law, in fact constitutes only a minority. Under the law, those employees who do not wish to join, as well as those whom the union for whatever reason excludes from membership, can neither bargain for themselves nor select any person or agency other than the union so designated to bargain for them. They are, in reality, the involuntary principals of agents imposed upon them by law. In granting unions this right, the Government, in effect, has bestowed upon them the power of government itself. Although this provision of law has certain usefulness in the area of collective bargaining, it results in the most serious injustice to those employees who wish to join the union but are excluded by the union itself. They have no voice in helping to determine the union's bargaining demands and policies, are not permitted to do their own bargaining, and they are compelled to accept and work under the terms and conditions of the agreements between the union and the employer, even if they find such terms and conditions highly unsatisfactory.

Moreover, in certain industries there is a widespread practice whereby employers recruit their labor force through the local unions in the particular area. This is particularly true in those industries where the most highly skilled, and consequently the most highly paid employees are needed to perform the work. It is precisely in these industries where union membership exclusionary policies are most widely and persistently applied. As a result, untold numbers of completely qualified workers, who for one reason or another are denied admission to union membership, are excluded not only from many jobs, but particularly from the most highly paid jobs as well.

The Republican Party, therefore, strongly denounces these exclusionary policies and advocates measures to end them. It firmly believes that no union should enjoy the unique and precious privilege of exclusive representation in collective bargaining if it arbitrarily excludes from membership those qualified workers who wish to join the union.

(b) A fundamental right: The right of an American Citizen to express his political preferences, and to give his support to the candidates and party of his choice is the fundamental political right on which our democratic society is based. Any interference with this right must be viewed with the greatest alarm. One of the most vicious forms of interference is to exert economic coercion on a citizen in order to compel his support for a particular political party, candidate or program by threatening him with loss of his livelihood if he withholds such support.

Thus, to take a hypothetical example, if an employer compelled his employees to contribute to a particular candidate or party as a condition of holding his job, the American public would be shocked beyond measure. An outraged public opinion would quickly compel such an employer to desist from this exercise in political blackmail. Fortunately, instances of this type are so rare, as for all practical purposes, to be non-existent.

Yet, there is one important and substantial area of American life in which precisely this form of political blackmail is well-nigh universal. Today, the vast majority of labor unions operate under collective bargaining agreements which require employees to join the union and pay periodic dues and initiation fees as a condition of holding their jobs. Regardless of what use the money an employee must pay to the union is put, no matter how objectionable he finds such use to be, if he refuses for that reason to pay his dues, the union can, and usually does, force the employer to fire him under the union-shop contract.

Every union today is using substantial portions of the funds collected from membership dues and initiation fees in behalf of specific candidates, parties, and political programs. The overwhelming majority of these unions have compulsory union membership contracts. Many employees who favor rival candidates, parties, and platforms, are nevertheless compelled, to contribute their money to support candidates, parties, and political programs they bitterly oppose or lose their jobs. This widespread practice constitutes the most nakedly brazen form of political coercion which exists in our society, and around which the liberal labor elements have succeeded in erecting an "iron curtain" of public misinformation and consequent apathy. As a result of this conspiracy of silence and of the sentimental belief that a union is always the underdog in its dealings with an employer, a belief assiduously cultivated by union leaders and their liberal allies, unions have been able to destroy the fundamental civil rights of an untold number of their members, who are truly the underdogs in their relations with their union leaders.

The Republican Party, therefore, pledges itself to make the strongest effort to correct this intolerable injustice by proposing and supporting measures which will restore to all of our citizens their basic human and constitutional rights to express and support their political preferences completely free from any form of restraint, intereference, or coercion.

(c) Law and order: One of the firmest pillars upon which American society rests is the proposition that law and order are an absolute essential for the preservation and improvement of our democratic way of life. A profound respect for the law and an abhorrence to disorder and anarchy are deeply ingrained in the American character.

There is one significant area where the disobedience to law and the resort to serious violence and physical coercion in complete disregard of fundamental rights is so widespread, so persistent, and so ignored that it constitutes a genuinely serious menace to the preservation of our free institutions. This situation shockingly illuminates the inconsistency, yes, the hypocrisy of many, particularly within the Democratic Party and its "liberal allies," who are so vehement in demanding obedience to the laws which they approve.

Labor disputes, increasingly, are erupting into violence. More and more, strikers and picket lines use force and intimidation to prevent employees who so desire from working and other individuals from entering upon their own property and operating their own authorities make little or no attempt to enforce the law by preventing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

establishments. In certain sections of the country where much of this type of unlawful violence occurs the police and the public the violence or by protecting those who wish to exercise their legal and constitutional rights. Again the sentimental myth of the union as underdog has been so arduously propagated by those who are most vociferous in demanding obedience to the law in other areas that the public has been completely misled and brainwashed into dangerous apathy.

We propose to do all we can to arouse the public to demand the elimination of this dangerous threat to our liberties and to the democratic structure of our society. We would prefer to leave this problem to solution on the State and local level where traditionally it belongs. But there are two factors which make this impracticable and thus require Federal law and the exercise of Federal power in order to attain an effective cure for this malignant social evil.

First, labor unions have attained their present size and strength, and hence their ability to defy the law, as a result of a series of special benefits, rights, privileges, and immunities bestowed upon them by the Federal statutes, and enjoyed by no other type of private organization or institution in our society. We enumerate a few of these:

1. Unions are immune from taxation.

2. Unions are practically immune under the antitrust laws.

3. Unions are immune, in many situations, against the issuance of injunctions by Federal courts.

4. Unions can compel employes to join unions in order to hold their jobs.

5. Unions can use funds, which their members have been compelled to contribute in order to hold their jobs, to finance political programs and candidates which some of these members strongly oppose.

6. Unions have been given the absolute right to deny workers admission to union membership, and, in practical effect, are able to deny many workers access to jobs in general and to the higher-paying jobs in particular.

7. Unions have the exclusive right to act as collective bargaining agents even for those workers who either do not wish to join the union or who are excluded from membership in it, even arbitrarily.

8. Unions have the right, in some situations, to invade the privacy of workers, even against their will, thus depriving them of a legal right enjoyed by all other individuals in our society.

9. And finally, and of the greatest significance, the granting of these rights by Federal law has resulted in the exclusion of the States from many of the areas covered by these Federal laws, and the States may not lawfully act in these areas. This is known as the doctrine of Federal preemption.

Second, labor disputes involving unlawful picket-line violence, as well as sabotage, threats, assaults on workers both at their homes and at their places of work, vandalism, destruction of property, even bombings, have occurred in many parts of the country. But law enforcement against these illegal activities has been most lax in the industrial North, particularly in the giant urban centers in some of the States in that section of the country.

A shocking example of such lawlessness, and of the lawlessness of the Democratic municipal administration in refusing to enforce the law, occurred recently in Philadelphia. General Electric's plants in Philadelphia were about to be struck by Jim Carey's IUE (International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO). General Electric notified the city authorities it intended to try to maintain operations and asked police protection for employees who might prefer to work and who would have to cross picket lines to do so.

Democratic Mayor (and ADA big wheel) Richardson Dilworth, 2 days after the 3-week strike ended, publicly denounced General Electric and declared that the company had sought to "blackmail" the city into using its police to get nonstrikers through the picket lines. He charged that General Electric had threatened to move its plants out of Philadelphia unless the city cooperated.

Dilworth said the union agreed not to resort to mass picketing if General Electric would agree not to try to keep its Philadelphia switch-gear plant working; he said that the company refused that compromise. He also said that the first attempts to get non-strikers through the picket lines showed that it couldn't be done without a risk of trouble—as public safety was involved in an area with schools nearby.

Mayor Dilworth's statements, and his position, are a complete demonstration not only of his lawless refusal to perform his public duties and his fundamental contempt for law and order, but of the unbelieveable hypocrisy which characterizes many so-called liberals when they profess their deep concern for civil rights in other parts of the country, particularly with respect to racial problems in the South.

First of all, it must be clearly understood that when a strike occurs which is not caused by any unlawful act of the employer, but is merely a result of his refusal to grant the union's demands (as was the situation in Philadelphia), the struck employer has not only a legal, but a constitutional right to continue to operate his plant and to have free access to his property; and any of his workers whom he invites to do so, have both a legal and constitutional right to refuse to join a strike and to enter his property, and continue working. This fundamental right which has existed from the beginning of our Republic was completely affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States in a case arising more than 20 years ago under the Wagner Act, organized labor's favorite piece of legislation. Not one jot or tittle of this legal doctrine and the basic right which it protects has ever been whittled away by any subsequent judicial decision. It is the law of the land today and every public official in the United States has both a legal and moral duty to honor it, and where the nature of his office so requires, to enforce it. Where this right is violated through threats, intimidation, coercion, or violence, it is the constitutional obligation of State and local officials to prevent such violence, protect the victims of it, and punish the perpetrators, because such misconduct constitutes not only a breach of State or local law, but because all law enforcement officials in the United States, on every level of government, are sworn to obey and enforce the Federal Constitution.

Another point to be remembered is that there is almost universal agreement that a mass picket line constitutes intimidation per se and inevitably leads to violence by pickets when nonstrikers, exercising their constitutional rights, seek to cross the picket line. As a matter of fact, mass picketing, as such is specifically outlawed in a number of States.

Thus when Mayor Dilworth plainly implies that the readiness of Carey's union to call off its mass picket line if the company agreed not to operate its plant, constitutes a just and reasonable compromise, he is actually saying that there is nothing wrong, either legally or ethically, with one party offering to cease its illegal or immoral conduct against the other party, only if the latter agrees not to exercise its legal and constitutional rights. This may be a compromise according to Dilworth, but the overwhelming majority of Americans will recognize it for what it is—unadulterated "blackmail" of which "the forgotten American" is also a victim.

It should also be added that Dilworth and those who share his views justify their breach of trust in refusing to enforce the law by pointing to the risk of trouble involved—in the Philadelphia case because public safety would be endangered because of the proximity of schools in the area of the strike.

As a general proposition, of course, this is never an excuse for permitting law and order to break down, for permitting deliberate flouting of the law with complete immunity for the culprits, and for giving free reign to disorder, anarchy and chaos. But the Dilworths profess greater horror when they believe that laws of which they approve are being defied, and demand total enforcement to the full extent of State, local, and Federal governmental power. One need only recall their reactions to and conduct in connection with such events as the Little Rock, Ark., school episode, the Autherine Lucy episode at the University of Alabama, and the current school difficulties in New Orleans.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Forgotten American Part II

A Statement of Proposed Republican Principles, Programs and Objectives

BY THE HONORABLE BARRY GOLDWATER
Senator from Arizona

A final appropriate commentary on Dilworth's conduct is the following statement which appeared in the story concerning the Philadelphia strike in the November 5, 1960 issue of the magazine Business Week:

"Generally, in Philadelphia, the Dilworth attack on GE (General Electric) was considered an ill-advised adventure, but not too surprising considering the mayor's prolabor orientation."

And it might be added that this orientation is not a matter of surprise either. Mayor Dilworth's election to office and his political survival depended on his support by the labor union leaders, and he, as well as they, know it.

The reason for such lawless refusal to enforce the law is not far to seek. The governments of these cities and most of the States in which they are located are in the hands of Democratic administrations which depend for their political survival on appeasing, even kowtowing to the labor union elements who are responsible for such lawlessness. That these elements and their sympathizers are not ungrateful is quite apparent in the results of the 1960 presidential election. The resources, time, energy, money and efforts of the labor union leaders and their supporters and subordinates, were indispensable to the election of Senator Kennedy. These union activities contributed substantially to securing the overwhelming Democratic margins in New York City, Buffalo, Boston, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Newark, Baltimore, Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City, Minneapolis-St. Paul, and Detroit, which made possible the winning of the huge electoral total in the States in which these cities are located. To expect the governments of these cities and their States to cure this intolerable and anti-American malady is to believe in miracles. Thus, we are reluctantly forced to conclude that only the Federal Government can take effective action to remedy a condition which spreads like a malignant cancer through the American body politic. The Republican Party, therefore, pledges itself to propose and support legislative measures to eliminate violence in labor disputes and thus to restore order and a respect of our national life, and, in so doing, regain for the forgotten American some of the fundamental rights which have been stolen from him.

(d) Landrum-Griffin Act: in 1959 Congress adopted the Landrum-Griffin Act by overwhelming margins and it was signed into law by President Eisenhower. In so doing, our Government for the first time recognized the need for Federal regulation of labor unions in order to eliminate corruption and crime, and to protect rank-and-file union members against the tyranny, possible and sometimes actual, of their own labor leaders. We strongly supported the enactment of this law and will strongly resist any effort to weaken the safeguards for the American worker which it provides. In fact, we are of the opinion that the Bill of Rights provisions in the Landrum-Griffin Act which protect rank-and-file members in the exercise of their rights as union members need strengthening. And they need it precisely in that area where a huge majority of the Democratic Party in the Senate succeeded in seriously weakening these safeguards by compelling the union member to bring a private suit to enforce his rights instead of requiring an appropriate Federal official or agency to bring such suit in his behalf, as was originally provided in the proposal offered by Senator MCCLELLAN, the chairman of the Senate's Labor Racketeering Committee.

The Republican Party, therefore, will propose amendments to the Landrum-Griffin Act to remedy this serious defect by giving the rank-and-file union member the aid and support of the Federal Government in seeking to vindicate his legal rights which have been violated by his union or its leaders.

(e) The right to strike: Free and voluntary collective bargaining is the surest guarantee of the preservation of a genuinely democratic society based primarily on an economic system of free enterprise. An indispensable element of free collective bargaining is the right of employees, acting in concert to withhold their labor in their effort to induce employers to grant them favorable terms and conditions of employment. This right to strike, subject to certain necessary limitations in the public interest, also constitutes a basic civil liberty. And even though strikes sometimes inflict some economic hardship on the public, a democratic society must be willing to pay that price and insist upon the preservation of the right.

There is, however, another aspect of the right to strike which our public officials, and the public itself, have hitherto largely ignored. Although strikes may sometimes inconvenience the public, they always impose hardship on the strikers and their families. The loss of wages resulting from even a short-lived strike can mean economic disaster for the striking employee and his dependents. Thus, no strike should be embarked on unless the decision to do so unquestionably reflects the will of the employees themselves, the very people who are sure to suffer hardship because of the strike.

It is true that many union constitutions require a favorable strike vote by a majority of the union members actually voting before the union officers are authorized to call a strike. However, there is no law requiring that such a vote be taken. As a result, many strikes are called by union leaders without adequate consultation with their membership; others are begun on the basis of votes taken by a show of hands in an open union meeting where those who do not favor a strike fear to indicate their opposition. In these situations, as usual, "the forgotten American" is ignored, and no effort made to determine his wishes.

We Republicans believe that, in reaching a decision of such momentous import to all wage earners in the struck establishment, certain minimum safeguards should be established by law to guarantee that the decision truly reflects the real wishes of an actual majority of the employees in such establishment. Only by such legislation can the American people be certain that the principals of personal responsibility and individual obligation, which, as we have pointed out, are essential to the preservation of a free, democratic, and moral society, are being effectively preserved.

The Republican party therefore supports legislation on the subject of strike votes based on the following simple requirements:

1. A strike shall be unlawful unless notice of intention to strike is given to all those concerned at least 30 days prior to the actual commencement of the strike.

2. At any time after such notice has been given, and prior to the termination of the strike, a petition may be filed by an employee with the National Labor Relations Board, asking the Board to conduct an election by secret ballot among the employees in the establishment to be struck, on the question of whether they favor a strike or its continuation. If such a petition is supported by 30 percent of said employees, the Board shall conduct such an election and the strike or its continuation shall be lawful only if a majority, so voting, cast their ballots in favor thereof.

This procedure has ample precedent in the existing law governing representation decertification, and deauthorization elections presently conducted by the Board, and the Board's own administrative requirements and procedures in connection with such elections. These are all based on the principle that such elections will be held

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon a showing that a substantial minority of the employees involved (never in any case more than 30 percent) want such election to be held. The principle is eminently sound and we strongly advocate its extension to important matter of the strike vote.

(f) Government employees: There are over 2 million Federal Government civilian employees whose jobs and the terms and conditions of whose employment are established and defined by Federal law. Many of these employees belong to bona fide and legitimate labor unions. From time to time these unions have asked Congress to authorize them to engage in collective bargaining with their Government agency employers.

In Federal Government employment there is only one employer—the people of the United States expressing their will through Congress and acting through supervisory personnel in the various executive departments and agencies. All those who are on the payroll from the head of the agency down to the worker in the lowest classification are equally employees of the people of the United States.

Therefore, it is our opinion that wages, hours, fringe benefits, vacations, holidays, sick leave, etc., are properly matters to be determined by Congress through legislation and are not a proper subject of collective bargaining. The appropriate way to deal with the people of the United States in their capacity as Government employer is to petition Congress to make the requested changes in the law. This is the proper relationship between the people in their private capacity and the people in their capacity as Government employer. It is the procedure which all other segments of our population must follow in their dealings with the Federal Government—Federal employees should not be an exception.

However, we realize that in the enormously expanded Federal bureaucracy, supervisory personnel often exercise their authority in an arbitrary, inequitable, and sometimes tyrannical fashion. Favoritism, discrimination, persecution against subordinate employees often exists and is always possible. Congress has done little by way of legislation to deal with those problems, and in the nature of things legislation is scarcely the way to handle them justly and effectively. It is here that a proper area exists for genuine collective bargaining.

The Republican Party therefore, recognizing that Federal employee unions are purely voluntary associations which do not have the right to strike, favors the enactment of legislation compelling responsible Government officials to bargain with unions of the employees in their agencies concerning grievances, disputes, alleged inequities, etc., as long as these do not invade the area of wages, working conditions, benefits, etc., reserved for the Congress. This is the democratic way for dealing with individual inequities, injustices, persecutions, favoritism, discrimination, and arbitrary exercise of power by supervisory Government officials generally.

III. SOCIAL WELFARE

"Although personal responsibility and initiative have been our national characteristics, explaining in large measure our country's progress in human welfare, yet pressures are growing for a constantly greater reliance on the collectivity rather than on the individual. An inordinate demand for benefits, most easily secured by the pressures of organization, has led an ever-growing number of our people to relinquish their rights and to abdicate their responsibilities. This concession creates a widening spiral of increasing demands and pressures with a further infringement on personal freedom and responsibility. * * * Intensive socialization can achieve mass benefits, but man and morality can be seriously hurt in the process." *

For the past 8 years, under a Republican administration, the American people as a whole have enjoyed unparalleled prosperity. Never in all history have the people of any nation had more jobs and received higher wages. As a result, private savings, insurance, and pension rights and benefits are at an all-time high. Rare is the worker or family which doesn't have some savings or insurance and the number coming under private pension plans has increased tremendously.

It is therefore quite natural that our people should be deeply concerned about any political program, which by causing inflation, will destroy the value of their savings, their insurance, and their future as well as present pension benefits. Therefore, in order to guard against any such possibility the Republican Party adopts the following policy:

We will oppose the initiation or expansion of any Federal welfare program requiring the expenditure of Federal funds unless such program meets the following conditions:

1. Taxes will not be increased.

2. Deficit spending which necessarily results in the creation of new money, unbalancing the budget, growth in the size of the national debt, and increase in the interest obligations of the Federal Government, all of which inevitably lead to inflation and a decline in the value of our money must not be resorted to. Private savings, insurance and pension funds cannot otherwise be protected.

3. Benefits under these programs shall be limited only to those States and localities which clearly demonstrate a need for such aid, and affirmatively demonstrate their inability to meet these needs entirely out of their own resources.

4. States receiving such aid shall match Federal contributions on a scale not less than the highest annual sums previously allotted by the State to comparable programs.

5. Wherever a program is absolutely essential and universally demanded, and it appears that it cannot be financed on the Federal level without resort to additional taxation or deficit spending, the entire Federal budget should be scrutinized with the most meticulous care. Every existing spending program should be examined with an eye to determining whether it can be cut down or even entirely eliminated. There is no doubt that there are many items in the Federal budget which are relatively so unimportant or so unnecessary that they can be reduced or discarded without any harm to the public welfare. There is no reason why such a process of government cost cutting and reduction cannot in most cases provide the necessary Federal funds for other more important and essential programs which would otherwise require resort to heaping new tax burdens on the already overloaded taxpayer, or to inflationary deficit spending.

The Republican Party believes that the tremendous growth in recent years of private savings, insurance and pension funds is a clear indication that our people believe in the traditional American principle that the primary responsibility for their financial security rests with the people and not with the government. We therefore strongly favor the extension and expansion of these private accumulations and plans and will encourage all private associations, organizations, and institutions in our Nation to participate in extending them by a program of new and increased tax deductions under the Federal income tax. We urge employers to move forward rapidly in setting up transferable insurance and pension programs for their employees. We strongly support the efforts of labor unions, through the collective bargaining process, to help in securing such transferable programs for the employees they represent.

As an example of how these private plans are increasing, the IAM (International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO), reports that the collective bargaining contracts of that union in 1960 include provisions for group retirement or pension plans in 40 percent of the contracts as compared with 4 percent in 1950, and group hospitalization and medical service in 86 percent of the contracts as compared with 17 percent in 1950.

If such a development continues, we can look forward to the day when the mandatory tax-financed governmental programs of social security will decline in importance as a source of financial security for our people; and that instead of being the main financial support of an increasing number of our retirees, social security will become only a minor and supplemental source of such support, the bulk of which will come from private plans established through private initiative and voluntary participation.

IV. EDUCATION

Most American colleges and universities are being forced to raise their tuition fees to cover even a part of their costs. As a result, many families find that financing the higher education of their

* Statement by the Catholic bishops, op. cit.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

children is extremely difficult. We believe that higher education for American youth is not only desirable but increasingly essential both in the national interest and for the sake of these young people themselves. We therefore believe that the Federal Government, which absorbs so much of the income of the American people in the form of taxes, should provide some relief in order to encourage and make possible a college education for those who have the ability to perform academic work on the college level.

Providing an education for their children is traditionally the responsibility of the American family and not of the Government. Hence, a Federal program to aid our young people to secure a college education should, wherever possible, avoid the form of Federal grants with their accompanying proliferation of Federal bureaucracy and Federal supervision, which not only wastes funds through unproductive administrative costs but creates a risk of undesirable Federal intervention in the educational process.

The Republican Party therefore strongly advocates a program of tax relief for families with children attending college. We will propose and support measures to give every family a substantial additional deduction for each child attending college. Such deductions will be limited to families in which the net taxable income does not exceed $20,000 after all exemptions and deductions have been taken, including the proposed deduction for children attending college.

To compensate for any loss of revenue resulting from such measures, other Federal programs of direct aid to college students should gradually be reduced, accompanied by the reduction or elimination of other less important Federal spending programs.

V. REVISION OF SENATE RULE XXII

The Republican Party opposes any relaxation of rule XXII which would have the effect of limiting the right of extended debate in the Senate.

The Senate has always prided itself on its justified reputation as the most deliberative legislative body in the world. The power of a minority to prevent the majority from engaging in hasty and ill-considered legislative action is consistent with the scheme of checks and balances and separation of powers written into the Constitution by the Founding Fathers which were designed to provide the same protection.

Nevertheless, the Republican Members of the Senate have rarely resorted to extended debate during the past decade. Actually, it has been the Democratic Members of the Senate, including some who are most vociferous in wishing to erase rule XXII, and to limit debate, who have engaged in the filibuster not only most frequently but on almost every occasion when it has been used in recent years. We do not mention this in condemnation of those who have resorted to this procedure. To the contrary, it is our intention to do all we can to preserve the right to utilize it as an essential safeguard against hasty and ill-considered legislative action.

The election on November 8 of this year clearly indicates that more than half of the voters rejected the extremely radical and spendthrift platform of the Democratic Party. Therefore, we feel that we have a moral obligation to resist the imposition of that platform on an unwilling public. Because of our minority positions in the Senate, we Republicans do not have nearly enough votes either to halt this reckless Democratic program or to compel its modification along saner and less extravagant lines. The volume of new Federal spending which the implementation of the Democratic platform would require must result either in an intolerable increase in the already unbearable burden of Federal taxation or in deficit financing on a scale which would make galloping inflation inevitable. We are certain that political considerations will make this latter course the one most likely to be adopted by the new Democratic administration. The history of the 20 years preceding 1953 bears witness to the cogency of our belief.

We do not intend to sit idly by while the wages, the savings, the insurance, the pension funds, and the social security benefits of our people are reduced to a mere fraction of their present value.

It is our purpose therefore to bring home to the American public the full import and catastrophic impact of the Democratic legislative proposals which will be introduced to implement their platform. This can be done most effectively by subjecting each of these measures to the most exacting scrutiny and the most extensive and informed debate on the Senate floor. No aspect of these proposals should remain undiscussed. The American people have a right to know what they signify down to the last detail. To achieve this goal of public education on these vital issues, extended debate in the Senate is absolutely essential. We shall therefore resist with all our strength any attempt to curtail such debate.

VI. ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

The purposes for which the electoral college was established by the Founding Fathers under the Constitution have long been abandoned. Consequently the distribution of electoral votes as a result of the winner-take-all procedure which now prevails bears little relationship to the popular vote received by the candidates in each State. The likelihood that a candidate who receives most of the popular votes will nonetheless lose to a rival who gets only a minority of the ballots, becomes more pronounced as presidential elections tend to become closer.

The Republican Party therefore supports those measures designed to modify the electoral college procedure to make it more reflective of the will of the electorate while retaining as many as possible of those desirable features which the Founding Fathers incorporated in the procedure.

One desirable incidental effect of such reform will be to put less of a premium on irregularity, fraud, and corruption in the conduct of our presidential elections. The Democratic Party maintains political machines led by political bosses in the large industrial cities of the North. These bosses and their machines seem to be able to deliver a Democratic margin of victory of whatever size is required to carry the entire State. The recent election has demonstrated that this ability is to a substantial degree based upon resort to irregularities and suspicious practices in the way the election process from initial registration to final counting is conducted. If the State's electoral vote does not go to the winner of the State in toto there will be less temptation to engage in these unwholesome practices. Another highly salutary effect of proper electoral-college reform will be the transformation in the platforms of both major political parties. These platforms will cease to be heavily in favor of specific geographical areas, particularly the giant urban centers, and will tend increasingly to take a national rather than a localized point of view. "The forgotten American" will thus be aided in regaining his appropriate place in the deliberations of both parties.

VII. FOREIGN POLICY

We believe that stimulating the national pride is even more important than increasing our national prestige. For too long have we permitted the tail to wag the dog—deferred to the ineffectual, even harmful policies of other nations, often in a fashion detrimental to our own national interests, yes, even to our national security.

It is high time that we cease fearing to give offense to so-called neutralists, unpredictable friends, unreliable allies, and even to the enemies who are resolved upon our destruction. In doing so, we have usually earned, not their respect, but their contempt, and have convinced them that they can push what they mistakenly regard as their own national interests at the expense of ours, at the expense of the security of the free world itself.

We think it is high time that we made clear to the rest of the free world that we are at least as necessary to their survival as they are to ours, and if we are not afraid to speak the truth, even more so.

The fact is plain but we either fear or are ashamed to acknowledge it—if we go down, the whole free world goes down; if we survive, all other nations have a realistic basis for hope of their own survival. Actually, if they genuinely desire freedom and independence, the United States alone is their only hope. Starting from this fundamental premise, a policy which reflects such an attitude will inspire the very respect that we have been trying to buy, and dispel the contempt which we have actually bought instead.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The free world is living under a stifling pall of fear—fear of the Soviet Union. Neutralism, coexistence, appeasement, pacifism, unilateral disarmament and suspension of nuclear testing are all products of this enervating fog of fear that smothers the free world and paralyzes its will to engage in strong and decisive action.

We Republicans therefore insist that an effective foreign policy should adhere to and develop from the following fundamental policy positions:

1. A hard anti-Communist line both in foreign affairs and with respect to internal subversion, despite attempts by some of our fearful allies to soften our position.

2. The protection of American interests and freedom should always be the primary objects of our policy regardless of foreign pressure to the contrary.

3. A complete distrust of the Soviet Union based on the knowledge that the Soviet Union will never honor an agreement which imposes disadvantages upon it. Direct proof of Soviet bad faith is not obtainable because of the Iron Curtain. But no such proof is necessary. The Soviet record speaks for itself, and the burden is on it to prove, by concrete evidence, that it is acting in good faith.

4. Immediate resumption of nuclear testing.

5. Absolute opposition to admission of Red China into the United Nations and a publicized readiness to withdraw from the U.N. if such admission is granted. We should take a leaf from the book of little Belgium which has threatened to withdraw unless certain U.N. activities in connection with the Congo are halted.

6. Reliance on ourselves in the development of our foreign policy. The tendency "to delegate excessive responsibility to an organization is discernible also in the realm of international affairs. Some manifest no sense of personal responsibility in the affairs of the international community. On the other hand, many citizens seem to feel that our mere adherence to the United Nations absolves us from further responsibility in the international order and that decisions made by the United Nations, regardless of their objective value, are always to be regarded as morally right.

"Admitting the undoubted value of a policy of supporting the United Nations and recognizing the genuine contribution it has made in many areas, we must understand clearly that the citizens of this country, and of all countries, have a responsibility to judge and to evaluate the United Nations' deliberations and decisions according to objective norms of morality universally binding. This involves also the duty of citizens to make proper representation of such judgment to their respective governments." *

7. More insistence that our major allies assume some of the burdens, particularly in the field of foreign economic aid, that we have shouldered practically alone for all these years.

8. Refusal to permit the surrender of a single inch of free territory anywhere in the world to Communist powers, where the retention of such territory represents a military advantage to ourselves or our allies, or where such surrender would have the psychological effect of impairing the morale of our allies, strengthening of our Communist enemies, or indicating weakness to the rest of the world. Such surrender can only thicken the pall of fear which weighs so heavily throughout the free nations, and in resisting the efforts of some of them to get us to make such surrender, to remember that their efforts are primarily inspired by this fear.

9. In giving aid, military and economic, the most generous allocations should go to those of our friends and allies who have demonstrated a longtime reliability and a continued willingness to resist the enemy. Others should receive such aid only if it is clearly demonstrated that granting it, in actuality strengthens American security.

10. Our attitude to nations in the non-Communist world should be determined on the basis of a greater emphasis on their friendship for the United States and their willingness to resist communism than on the ideological character of their governments and the nature of their domestic policies.

11. Where opposition movements to Communist regimes exist, whether inside or outside the Soviet and Soviet satellite nations, encouragement and concrete aid should be given to those movements publicly and proudly.

12. The United States must remain fully and effectively armed.

In adopting these positions, we repudiate the policies of the Democratic administrations which led to the conquest of China by the Communists, the Soviet enslavement of eastern and central Europe, and our involvement in the Korean war which that same policy, having gotten us into the war, prevented us from winning.

We are certain that these positions reflect the basic and often inarticulate attitudes of the overwhelming majority of all Americans, the forgotten American, and their pride in and love for their country. Resting on this certainty, we profoundly proclaim this Republican program to the people of the United States.

"I have little interest in streamlining government or in making it more efficient, for I mean to reduce its size. I do not undertake to promote welfare, for I propose to extend freedom. My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them. It is not to inaugurate new programs, but to cancel old ones that do violence to the Constitution, or that have failed in their purpose or that impose on the people an unwarranted financial burden. I will not attempt to discover whether legislation is 'needed' before I have first determined whether it is constitutionally permissible. And if I should later be attacked for neglecting my constituents' 'interests,' I shall reply that I was informed their main interest is liberty and that in that cause I am doing the very best I can."

SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER
in his book
The Conscience of a Conservative
VICTOR PUBLISHING COMPANY, Shepherdsville, Ky.

HUMAN EVENTS 410 First Street, S. E. Washington 3, D.C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE FORGOTTEN AMERICAN" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 24-page article: single copy 25c (coins not stamps); 8 copies $1; 100 copies $7; 500 copies $30; 1,000 copies $50. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 24-page article, add 1c per copy; for airmail delivery of 24-page article, add 4c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $12.50

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

* Statement by the Catholic bishops, op. cit.

IF YOU LIKE THIS ARTICLE . . . . You should subscribe to HUMAN EVENTS, the weekly Washington Newsletter, reporting to 40,000 business and political leaders on politics, labor, taxes and business. HUMAN EVENTS will tell you each week the news behind the news from the Nation's Capital. TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: $1 for 5 weeks. One year: $12.50. YOUR MONEY BACK IF DISSATISFIED.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED